



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,677	11/05/2001	Jun Kamada	826.1492D	4025
21171	7590	12/11/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER JUNG, DAVID YIUK	
			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/985,677

Applicant(s)

KAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

David Y. Jung

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 4,39 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 4,39,48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **CLAIMS PRESENTED**

Claims 1-3, 5-38, 40-47, 49-54 have been cancelled.

Claims 4, 39, 48 are presented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 39, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being anticipated by Shimizu (US Patent 6,005,936) and Godfrey (year 1999, Re: Password Encryption).

Claim 4: Shimizu teaches A system for managing files, comprising: a main-file storing unit storing a main-file in a non-secure area (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the saving of the image data D);

an authentication information creating unit creating main-file authentication information

to be used to verify the main-file (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from the image data D); and a sub-file storing unit storing the main-file authentication information [ ] (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from the image data D; column 2, lines 20-28, i.e., authentication information is attached separately from the image data – indeed, Shimizu notes that such separate nature has been a well known prior art and Shimizu even suggests an improvement from such prior art).

These passages of Shimizu does not teach that the authentication information be “in at least one sub-file in a secure area.”

Godfrey teaches “authentication information be in at least one sub-file in a secure area (the first paragraph, i.e. the password is encrypted and stored in a different part of the table that is not accessible to some users)” for the motivation of security.

Thus, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Shimizu and Godfrey so as to teach the claimed invention.

Claim 39: Shimizu teaches A method of managing files, comprising the steps of: storing a main-file in a non-secure area (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the saving of the image data D); creating main-file authentication information to be used to verify the main-file (column 1,

lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from the image data D); and

storing the main-file authentication information (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from the image data D; column 2, lines 20-28, i.e., authentication information is attached separately from the image data – indeed, Shimizu notes that such separate nature has been a well known prior art and Shimizu even suggests an improvement from such prior art).

These passages of Shimizu does not teach that the authentication information be “in at least one sub-file in a secure area.”

Godfrey teaches “authentication information be in at least one sub-file in a secure area (the first paragraph, i.e. the password is encrypted and stored in a different part of the table that is not accessible to some users)” for the motivation of security.

Thus, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Shimizu and Godfrey so as to teach the claimed invention.

Claim 48: Shimizu teaches A computer readable medium encoded with a recorded file management computer program, which when executed, causes a computer to execute the method comprising:  
main-file storing step of storing a main-file in a non-secure area (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the saving of the image data D);  
creating main-file authentication information to be used to verify the main-file (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from

the image data D); and

storing the main-file authentication information [ ] (column 1, lines 42-57, i.e., the authentication information which is attached as a file separate from the image data D; column 2, lines 20-28, i.e., authentication information is attached separately from the image data – indeed, Shimizu notes that such separate nature has been a well known prior art and Shimizu even suggests an improvement from such prior art).

These passages of Shimizu does not teach that the authentication information be “in at least one sub-file in a secure area.”

Godfrey teaches “authentication information be in at least one sub-file in a secure area (the first paragraph, i.e. the password is encrypted and stored in a different part of the table that is not accessible to some users)” for the motivation of security.

Thus, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Shimizu and Godfrey so as to teach the claimed invention.

### ***Conclusion***

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Application/Control Number:  
09/985,677  
Art Unit: 2134

Page 6

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Points of Contact***

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Application/Control Number:  
09/985,677  
Art Unit: 2134

Page 7

Or:

(571) 273-3836 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (272) 272-3811.

David Jung

-----

Patent Examiner

12/9/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'David Jung', with a stylized, wavy line extending from the end of the signature.